

HANDOUT HABITAT #1

Weighting Factors for Restoration Opportunity Area Step 2 Evaluation Criteria

***Note:** This handout presents the criteria, values, and weighting factors used to assess the extent of potential tidal restoration opportunities presented in Handout #3 for each of the ROAs.*

Step 2 Evaluation Criteria	Criteria Values	Criteria Value Weighting Factor
1. Requires construction of new or relocation of existing major infrastructure (roads, powerlines, railroads, pipelines)	1. Very high (federal/state highways)	1
	2. High (multiple local roads/powerlines)	2
	3. Moderate (few local roads)	3
	4. Low	4
2. May require building of new levees	1. >1 mile	1
	2. <1 mile	3
	3. None	5
3. Level of likely difficulty to secure third party agreements (if necessary) to implement the restoration (e.g., require change in agencies policies/regulations; require legislative or congressional action; require funding contributions by a third party to make cost effective)	1. High (project levees/railroads)	1
	2. Moderate (non-project levees/powerlines)	1
	3. Low	1
4. Effects on local Reclamation District infrastructure and functions, including drainage, conveyance, and flood protection and effects on adjacent land uses	1. High (substantially below msl/major portion of district affected)	1
	2. Moderate	1
	3. Low (lands in intertidal elevation or higher/likely addressed by canal/restoration removes district)	1
5. Impacts on the ability to divert water	1. High (large number of diversions to relocate relative to area)	1
	2. Moderate	1
	3. Low (small or no diversions to relocate/restoration eliminates diversion)	1
6. Number and size of parcels/landowners	1. Many small parcels (<160 acres)	1
	2. About an even mix of large and small parcels	2
	3. Mostly large parcels (>160 acres)	3
7. Extent of adjacent lands suitable for	1. Minimal	1

HANDOUT HABITAT #1

transitional uplands	2. Potential for constraints in very long term	2
	3. Substantial	3
8. Tidal connectivity	1. Low (constricted channels)	1
	2. Moderate (connectivity, but tides likely muted)	3
	3. High	5
9. Existing land uses of high economic value	1. High (>50% perennial crops)	1
	2. Moderate (>50% prime farmland/25-50% perennial crops)	2
	3. Low (<50% prime farmland, <25% perennial crops)	3
10. Existing conditions/land uses of high ecological value	1. High (lands managed for wildlife)	1
	2. Low (common habitat within Delta)	3
11. Proximity to significant wastewater discharge and diversion points	1. May substantially affect restored habitat values	1
	2. May have limited effect on restored habitat values	1
	3. Unlikely to affect restored habitat values	1
12. Proximity to important occupied species habitats (e.g., spawning areas, major outmigration corridors)/ Landscape position relative to existing patches of habitat and other habitat restoration sites [combined these]	1. >1mile	1
	2. <1mile	3
	3. Within or adjacent to	5
13. Estimated likelihood for complementary benefits upstream/downstream relative to other opportunities (e.g., good pathways for distributing organic carbon from restored marsh to large portions of the Delta)	1. Low	1
	2. Moderate	2
	3. High	3
	4. Very high	4
14. Synergies with other restoration planning efforts	1. May conflict with other planning efforts	1
	2. No conflicts, potential minor benefits	1
	3. Potential high synergies	1
15. Affects in delta exports and water quality	1. May degrade WQ	1
	2. No or minimal effect	1
	3. Likely enhances ability	1
16. Proportion that is public land/in conservation easements that reasonably could be made available for restoration	1. None	1
	2. <50%	3
	3. 50-75%	4
	4. >75%	5
17. Substantial fill or subsidence reversal likely required	1. >20% requires fill	1
	2. .10-20% requires fill	3
	3. <10% requires fill	5

DRAFT